

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION
No. 5:16-HC-2027-D

FELIX M. PALACIOS,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN OF FCI-BUTNER,

Respondent.

ORDER

On August 2, 2016, Magistrate Judge Numbers issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”) [D.E. 9]. In that M&R, Judge Numbers granted petitioner’s motions to amend his petition [D.E. 4, 8], denied petitioner’s motions for appointment of counsel [D.E. 5, 8] and to take a deposition [D.E. 6], and recommended that the court dismiss petitioner’s habeas petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 without prejudice and deny petitioner’s remaining motions [D.E. 2, 7] as moot. Petitioner did not file objections to the M&R.

“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (emphasis, alteration, and quotation omitted); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and the petition. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. Accordingly, the court adopts the conclusions in the

M&R [D.E. 9]. The court DENIES a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336–38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 30 day of August 2016.



JAMES C. DEVER III
Chief United States District Judge